

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the application.

**I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. (U.S. 6,336,124) in view of Makipaa et al. (U.S. 6,556,217) and Kanevsky (U.S. 6,300,947).

Claim 1 recites the feature of a layout rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined layout rules, each of which defines a layout method for each type of the component elements of the information, and which are applicable to the component elements. The Examiner recognizes that neither Alam nor Makipaa discloses or suggests such a feature. The Examiner, however, applies Kanevsky and alleges that Kanevsky cures this deficiency. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Regarding Kanevsky, Applicants note that this reference discloses a web page adaptation system that provides the ability to view information on display screens having different dimensions (see col. 1, lines 57-65). For example, Kanevsky discloses that if the size of a display screen is too small to allow the display of all textual and icon information, that the web page is linked to new smaller pages that fully fit the display (see col. 2, lines 8-12).

Further, Applicants note that Kanevsky discloses that a display terminal can have an associated mode number which permits the system to identify the display parameters for the display terminal based upon identification of the mode number (see col. 6, lines 58-64). Thus, in Kanevsky, information to be transmitted to a user can be modified based on the size of the

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

user's display screen such that the requested information is able to fit within the user's display screen.

As noted above, claim 1 recites the feature of a plurality of predetermined layout rules, each of which defines a layout method for each type of the component elements of the information, and which are applicable to the component elements. In other words, according to claim 1, the layout rules are applicable to the component elements of the information.

Based on the foregoing description of Kanevsky, it is clear that while the layout rules of Kanevsky are applicable to the size of the user's display screen (i.e., requested information is modified to fit within a user's display screen), the layout rules are not in any way whatsoever applicable to the information itself. In other words, while Kanevsky provides different layout rules for display screens having different sizes (e.g., a first layout rule for a standard PC monitor, and a second layout rule for a palmtop display), Kanevsky does not provide different layout rules which are applicable to the component elements of the information.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the feature of a layout rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined layout rules, each of which defines a layout method for each type of the component elements of the information, and which are applicable to the component elements, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

In addition, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended to recite that the layout part is operable to generate a layout result, the display range determination part is operable to determine a display range of the layout result, and the display part is operable to generate screen data in the display range. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach or suggest such features.

Regarding the cited prior art references, Applicants note that Alam discloses a method of converting a document in an input format into a document in a different output format, wherein the supported input and output formats include formats such as HTML, XML and PDF (see col. 5, lines 29-35 and 51-53). In converting the document to the output format, an algorithm is provided for dividing the data of the document into elements such that each element can be displayed within a display configuration (i.e., within the dimensions of the display screen) (see col. 17, lines 11-18).

Regarding Makipaa, Applicants note that this reference discloses a method for displaying information which identifies a user terminal type and a screen size of the user terminal upon a logon of the user terminal (see col. 3, lines 16-18). Layout rules and typographical settings are then extracted based on this identified information, wherein the data can be resized such that it is able to fit on the screen of the user terminal (see col. 3, lines 18-28).

Lastly, regarding Kanevsky, as noted above, this reference discloses a web page adaptation system in which information to be transmitted to a user can be modified based on the size of the user's display screen such that the requested information is able to fit within the user's display screen.

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

Thus, as is evident from the descriptions above of Alam, Makipaa and Kanevsky, it is evident that each of these references first determines the dimensions of a user's display screen, and then modifies data that is to be transmitted to the user such that the data can fit within the user's display.

As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the layout part is operable to generate a layout result, the display range determination part is operable to determine a display range of the layout result, and the display part is operable to generate screen data in the display range. Thus, according to amended claim 1, the display range determined by the display range determination part is of the generated layout result.

That is, according to claim 1, a layout result is generated and then a display range of this generated layout result is determined. Thus, as the determined display range in claim 1 is of the generated layout result, not of a user's display screen, each of the component elements can be laid out without being limited by the dimensions of the user's display screen. In contrast, as noted above, each of the cited prior art references indicate that the dimensions of a user's display screen are known prior to organizing the data, such that the data can be organized in a manner to fit within the user's display.

On the other hand, according to the present invention, if the generated layout result exceeds the dimensions of the display screen, the screen data will be composed of merely a portion of the generated layout result.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Alam, Makipaa and Kanevsky does not teach or suggest that a layout part is operable to generate a

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

layout result, a display range determination part is operable to determine a display range of the layout result, and a display part is operable to generate screen data in the display range, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Further, Applicants note that claim 1 is drawn to a display device for performing a screen switching in response to a user input, the display device including a user input part operable to receive the user input. Thus, according to claim 1, in response to a user input to a user input part, the display device is operable to perform screen switching. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

Regarding the above-noted feature of a user input part operable to receive the user input, Applicants note that the Examiner has taken the position that Alam discloses such a feature (see Office Action at page 3). In particular, the Examiner has pointed to the disclosure in Alam which indicates that a user is able to specify one or more output formats (see col. 5, lines 38-42).

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the ability to specify one or more output formats (e.g., HTML, XML, and PDF) in Alam does not in any way relate to screen switching. Accordingly, as noted above, as claim 1 is drawn to a display device for performing a screen switching in response to a user input, wherein the display device includes a user input part operable to receive the user input, Applicants respectfully submit that Alam does not disclose such features. Further, Applicants submit that Makipaa and Kanevsky fail to cure this deficiency of Alam.

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 2-8, Applicants note that each of these claims depends from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

B. The Examiner has rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Makipaa and Kanevsky, and further in view of Thurlow et al. (U.S. 6,057,841).

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Thurlow fails to cure the deficiencies of Alam, Makipaa and Kanevsky, as discussed above, with respect to claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9 and 10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 9 recites the feature of a user input process rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined user input process rules applicable to the user input.

The Examiner recognizes that neither Alam nor Makipaa nor Kanevsky discloses or suggests such a feature. The Examiner, however, applies Thurlow and alleges that Thurlow cures this deficiency. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Applicants note that Thurlow discloses a system for processing electronic messages (e.g., e-mail) by applying user created rules for managing incoming and outgoing

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

messages (see col. 9, lines 18-20). The user created rules are able to execute specific tasks when certain criteria regarding a message is met (see col. 9, lines 20-24).

For example, as shown in Tables I and II of Thurlow, a user may choose a condition, such as, "if body contains specific words" as well as an action, such as, "delete it" (see Tables I and II in col. 11 and 12, respectively). Accordingly, if such a rule is created, if the body of the message contains specific words chosen by the user, then the message will be automatically deleted.

Based on the foregoing description of Thurlow, it is clear that the process rules of Thurlow are applicable to e-mail messages, not to the user input itself. In other words, while Thurlow provides the ability to create rules that manage e-mail messages (e.g., where a certain message will be stored), there is absolutely no disclosure whatsoever in Thurlow indicating that theses rules are applicable to the user input itself, as recited in claim 9.

According to the present invention, by providing rules that are applicable to user input, it is possible to change the effect that a particular user input (e.g., an input from a keypad) will have on displayed information by changing the selected rule.

With respect to the above-discussed feature recited in claim 9, Applicants note that the Examiner has indicated in section B of the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action that Thurlow "discloses a method that allows a user to build rules by choosing predefined conditions and actions, which are presented via a graphical user interface." Applicants note, however, that such disclosure does not correspond to the language recited in claim 9.

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

That is, even though Thurlow may disclose a method that allows user to build rules by choosing predefined conditions and actions, as discussed above, these rules are applicable to e-mail messages, and are in no way whatsoever applicable to user input, as recited in claim 9.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the feature of a user input process rule change part containing a plurality of predetermined user input process rules applicable to user input, as recited in claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

If the Examiner disagrees and maintains the position that Thurlow discloses process rules applicable to user input, as recited in claim 9, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to provide a detailed explanation in this regard so that Applicants may make an informed decision with regard to appeal.

C. The Examiner has rejected claims 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Makipaa and Thurlow et al.

Regarding claim 11, Applicants note that this claim recites the feature of a user input process rule change part containing a plurality of user input process rules applicable to the user input. For at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Alam nor Makipaa nor Thurlow discloses or suggests such a feature.



U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

In particular, as noted above, while Thurlow may disclose a method that allows user to build rules by choosing predefined conditions and actions, these rules are applicable to e-mail messages, and are in no way whatsoever applicable to user input, as recited in claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 11 has also been amended in a similar manner as discussed above with respect to claim 1. In particular, claim 11 has been amended to recite that the layout part is operable to generate a layout result, the display range determination part is operable to determine a display range of the layout result, and the display part is operable to generate screen data in the display range.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Alam nor Makipaa discloses, suggests or otherwise renders obvious such features. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Thurlow fails to cure this deficiency of Alam and Makipaa. As noted above, Thurlow merely discloses the ability to generate rules which are applicable to e-mail messages.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Further, Applicants note that claim 11 is also drawn to a display device for performing a screen switching in response to a user input, the display device including a user input part operable to receive the user input. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Alam and Makipaa do not disclose, suggest or

U.S. Application No. 09/902,261

otherwise render obvious such features. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Thurlow fails to cure this deficiency of Alam and Makipaa.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 12-17, Applicants note that these claims depend from claim 11 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

## II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiyoshi OGISHI et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields  
Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/dib  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 22, 2005